

Date: Sat, 3 Apr 93 04:30:48 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #84
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 3 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 84

Today's Topics:

 2 meter phone calls?
 Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines
 No-code issue (4 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 2 Apr 1993 16:31:26 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!wa4mei!
ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 2 meter phone calls?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr1.165240.27241@hemlock.cray.com> dadams@cray.com writes:

>
>Yes, and saying, "Are you going to get some pizza?" (Without suggesting
>any brand, store, or etc. does not come nearly as close to facilitating
>business affairs as does the question, "Are you going to get a new
>radio?" Would you be restricted from asking, "Are you going to buy
>a Yeasu?"

But the FCC has specifically permitted the buying and selling of
amateur related equipment over the air as an *exception* to their
general rule about pecuniary interests on the air. Since they thought
it necessary to *spell out* this exception, I think that makes clear
their intent to *generally* prohibit such actions when applied to
other than amateur gear.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Sat, 3 Apr 1993 00:33:42 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!icon.rose.hp.com!greg@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ron Natalie (ron@topaz.bds.com) wrote:

: > The question is, do beepers pose the same hazards on aircraft as
: > do other radio receivers.
:
: Yes.
:
: The issue however is what, if any, this hazard is. However, the FAA has
: a very simple rule. If you have a portable electronic device, the airline
: must determine whether it is safe to use that on board (other than portable
: voice recorders, hearing aids, heart pacemakers, and electric shavers, which
: have blanket acceptance).

^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Geez! If the purpose is to determine the potential for interference, why
in the world would they let one of these things loose on a plane? Granted,
you're not likely to see half of Business Class get up and shave during a
flight, but I'd bet a dozen laptops would stand a much better chance at
passing FCC-B than one electric shaver.

Greg.

Date: 2 Apr 1993 18:38:16 +0300
From: mcsun!news.funet.fi!butler.cc.tut.fi!lehtori.cc.tut.fi!not-for-
mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: No-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mellob@cary104.its.rpi.edu (Brett A. Mellor) writes:

> So I feel fine about the code requirement. I would prefer that

> the entry-level technician license be non-renewable. Leading
> to the idea that you would have to upgrade eventually.

Why should it be mandatory to get a HF-licence if you are only interested in VHF/UHF/SHF activities ? I personally prefer experimenting in the VHF/UHF bands and think that the HF-frequency range is most usable as the 1st or 2nd IF in a transverter :-)

It might be a surprise for some hams that not all hams are interested in hunting DX-countries or trying to step on each other in something that is called a contest. In 1993 it is hard to see why all operators should be trained for this kind of operating habits.

Paul OH3LWR

Mail: Hameenpuisto 42 A 26 Phone : +358-31-133 657
SF-33200 TAMPERE Telex : 58-100 1825 (ATTN: Keinanen Paul)
FINLAND Internet: Paul.Keinanen@Telebox.tele.fi
X.400 : G=Paul S=Keinanen O=Elisa-Tampere A=ELISA C=FI

Date: 2 Apr 1993 21:47:19 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!asuvax!chnews!joshua!jbromley@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <61b5_6=@rpi.edu> mellob@rpi.edu writes (as if composing a poem):

>
> The harder you work to achieve something, the more
> you will respect your accomplishments.

[deleted]

> Keep in mind that these are generalizations, there are always
> exceptions. :-)

Well, smiley or no, they are gross generalizations. And they are generalizations that the U.S. government has written into the rules and regulations of a quasi-judicial agency. I wish the FCC would be a little more up-front about exactly **what** the 5/13/20 wpm radiotelegraph operating proficiency requirements are supposed to do to fulfill the federal government's regulatory charter.

> So I feel fine about the code requirement. I would prefer that...

But why particularly a code requirement, at a particular speed for access to particular frequencies. If it is to imbue that access with a perception of individual accomplishment, let them put it out there in Part 97. Or hand down a binding opinion. Or something.

> the entry-level technician license be non-renewable. Leading
> to the idea that you would have to upgrade eventually.

> So in someone else's words, quit wining and do it.

>
> -Brett Mellor -- mellob@rpi.edu
> Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
> Troy, New York

```
+-----+-----+
| Jim Bromley W5GYJ          |          wining          |
| Intel Corp. m/s CH3-91    | Celebrating 30 years as a No-Code Technician |
| 5000 W. Chandler Blvd.    |          ^               |
| Chandler,AZ 85226         |                           |
| tel: 602-554-5183        | Internet: jlbromley@sedona.intel.com         |
+-----+-----+
```

Date: Fri, 2 Apr 1993 22:30:12 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!rpi!cary115.its.rpi.edu!
mellob@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-Code Issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

k23690@lehtori.cc.tut.fi (Kein{nen Paul) writes:

> Why should it be mandatory to get a HF-licence if you are only
> interested in VHF/UHF/SHF activities ? I personally prefer
> experimenting in the VHF/UHF bands and think that the HF-
> frequency range is most usable as the 1st or 2nd IF in a
> transverter :-)

O.K. I'll buy that argument as long as you are not a "down
with code fanatic." Dont forget my original intention, to
support the code-requirement for HF.

> It might be a surprise for some hams that not all hams are
> interested in hunting DX-countries or trying to step on each
> other in something that is called a contest. In 1993 it is
> hard to see why _all_ operators should be trained for this

> kind of operating habits.

HF is my favorite aspect of Ham-Radio. And I am not "against" VHF/UHF either. However, I neither hunt DX-countries nor do I participate in contests. And the General, the "HF" test, does not require you to know how to do either.

I just don't want you to be anti-HF because you prefer using VHF,UHF, and SHF. Likewise, I like to use HF, but I am not anti-VHF+.

-Brett Mellor -- mellob@rpi.edu
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York

Date: Sat, 3 Apr 1993 03:50:00 GMT
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!rpi!cary103.its.rpi.edu!
mellob@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: No-code Issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jbromley@joshua.intel.com (James Bromley~) writes:

>Well, smiley or no, they are gross generalizations. And they are
>generalizations that the U.S. government has written into the rules
>and regulations of a quasi-judicial agency. I wish the FCC would be
>a little more up-front about exactly *what* the 5/13/20 wpm radiotelegraph
>operating proficiency requirements are supposed to do to fulfill the
>federal government's regulatory charter.

I feel fine about the code requirement.

But why particularly a code requirement, at a particular speed for access to particular frequencies. If it is to imbue that access with a perception of individual accomplishment, let them put it out there in Part 97. Or hand down a binding opinion. Or something.

Case in point: Whining.

I personally don't think that rote memorization should get you a Ham ticket. It should be something more challenging.

Why do you feel that my stating that the harder you work for something,
the more you respect it, is a "gross generalization?"

-Brett Mellor -- mellob@rpi.edu
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York

Date: Fri, 2 Apr 1993 18:51:33 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!utnut!torn!watserv2.uwaterloo.ca!watmath!watcgl!
watpix.uwaterloo.ca!awpaeth@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar20.4727.8761@dosgate>, <1993Mar21.193915.8663@ssc.com>,
<jfhC4Cpv8.Axp@netcom.com>x.uwat
Subject : Re: Hamming in International Waters (was:Re: 2 ham licences ?)

Harv Hobson (jhobson@SU19F.ess.harris.com) makes the great quip:
>But, what if your ship sank and you were in an innertube in international
>waters? Could you legally order pizza via amateur radio? :)

My retort:

"I'll take it delivered: 'thirty minutes or its FREE'. AND HOLD THE ANCHOVIES!"

/Alan Paeth
VE3AWP (and) KD3XG
dual citizen/dual bander

PS - And where should VE3-land/Ontario and Pennsylvania (my KD3 QTH) happen
to adjoin? Along a narrow line in the middle of Lake Erie! Always wanted
to float out there and contest. Hitting repeaters using a "Rubber Ducky"
takes on a whole new meaning!

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #84
